

Program Narrative

1. System Description: Structure and Function of the Juvenile Justice System

California's objective is to improve its juvenile justice system by preventing juvenile delinquency, providing fair treatment and wellbeing of youth involved in the juvenile justice system, reducing crime, and ensuring compliance with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) requirements. California is dedicated to successfully administering local grant programs and funding relevant and effective statewide initiatives.

California's juvenile justice system encompasses the agencies that have a role in the processing of juveniles alleged to be involved in criminal or delinquent behavior, status offenses, and minor traffic violations. California's juvenile justice system is composed of many responsible agencies that work in a coordinated fashion to address juvenile justice related issues:

1. **Law Enforcement** (County Sheriffs, City Police Departments, California Highway Patrol, etc.) – enforces the laws within its jurisdiction by investigating complaints and making arrests.¹
2. **District Attorney** – files WIC 602 petitions, represents the community at all Juvenile court hearings and may act in the juvenile's behalf on WIC 300² petitions. WIC 602 petitions allege that a juvenile committed an act that would be against the law if committed by an adult. WIC 300 petitions allege that a child has suffered, or is at risk of suffering serious physical harm, sexual abuse, neglect, etc.
3. **Public Defender** – represents juveniles in WIC 601³ and WIC 602 proceedings and may represent parents in WIC 300 petitions. A court appointed or private attorney

¹ Welfare and Institutions Code section 601 provides, in part, "any person who is under 18 years of age when he or she violates any law of this state or of the United States or any ordinance of any city or county of this state defining crime other than an ordinance establishing a curfew based solely on age, is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, which may adjudge such person to be a ward of the court."

² Welfare and Institutions Code section 300 provides for a child to become a dependent child of the court when "[t]he child has suffered, or there is a substantial risk that the child will suffer, serious physical harm inflicted nonaccidentally upon the child by the child's parent or guardian."

³ Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 provides, in part, "Any person under 18 years of age who persistently or habitually refuses to obey the reasonable and proper orders or directions of his or her parents, guardian, or custodian, or who is beyond the control of that person, or who is under the age of 18 years when he or she violated any ordinance of any city or county of this state establishing a curfew based solely on age is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court which may adjudge the minor to be a ward of the court."

may also be used. WIC 601 petitions allege runaway behavior, truancy, curfew violations, and/or regular disobedience.

4. **Probation** – provides a screening function for the Juvenile Court; maintains intake services and detention facilities for wards adjudicated pursuant to WIC 602, provides intake, shelter care, and counseling services for juveniles in WIC 601 cases; provides the court with a study of the minor’s situation; and provides supervision for the minor as ordered by the court.
5. **Health and Human Services Department** (dependent intake, Children’s Protective Services, placement, etc.) – offers services to juveniles referred as possible dependent/neglected children, investigates and files WIC 300 petitions on behalf of juveniles and provides supervision of WIC 300 cases.
6. **Juvenile Court** – hears facts regarding WIC 300, 601, and 602 petitions, makes findings and adjudicates cases. The juvenile court has the final authority in all juvenile matters under its jurisdiction.
7. **The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s (CDCR) Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)** – DJJ houses for treatment, training and education youth committed by the juvenile and criminal courts. for serious and violent offenses set forth in Welfare and Institutions Code section 707(b), The DJJ population is a small percentage of the youth who are arrested in California each year, and they have needs that cannot be addressed by county programs. Most juvenile offenders today are committed to county facilities in their home community where they can be closer to their families and local social services that are vital to rehabilitation. DJJ’s population represents less than one percent of the 225,000 youths arrested in California each year.⁴ As part of the state’s criminal justice system, the DJJ works closely with law enforcement, the courts, district attorneys, public defenders, probation and a broad spectrum of public and private agencies concerned with, and involved in, the problems of youth.

Upon making an arrest, a law enforcement agency typically refers youth to the applicable probation department in the juvenile’s county of residence. Probation departments

4 http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Juvenile_Justice/index.html. Includes referrals and arrests.

investigate all referrals received and make a determination of how to proceed with each. Disposition of cases include counsel and release, transfer to the jurisdiction where the minor resides, wardship and probation, out-of-home placement, commitment to juvenile hall or camp, and commitment to the DJJ. Please see Appendix A for more information on the structure of the juvenile justice system in California.

In addition, there are non-justice related State agencies participating in the administration of programs for at-risk California youth:

California Department of Education (CDE)

Community Day Schools

Community day schools serve mandatory and other expelled students, and other high-risk youths. The instructional day includes academic programs that provide challenging curriculum, individual attention to student learning modalities and abilities and focus on the development of pro-social skills and student self-esteem and resiliency.

Juvenile Court Schools

Juvenile court schools provide mandated public education services for juvenile offenders who are under the protection or authority of the county juvenile justice system. The juvenile court school provides quality learning opportunities for students to complete a course of study leading to a high school diploma. Students must take all required public education assessments (e.g. The California High School Exit Examination, Standardized Testing and Reporting Program).

Opportunity Education Program

The Opportunity Education program provides support for students who struggle to perform in the traditional education system, as well as a supportive environment with specialized curricula, instruction, guidance and counseling, psychological services, and tutorial assistance to help students overcome barriers to learning.

Program Access & Retention Initiative

This program promotes dropout prevention, recovery, and retention services for all students at risk of not completing a high school education.

California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)

The Adolescent Treatment Program provides substance abuse treatment and early intervention services.⁵ Generally, services include residential treatment for adolescents in group home settings, services for youth transitioning into the community after discharge from institutional facilities, outpatient programs in the community, and services at school sites.

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

Chafee Educational Vouchers (ETV) program

The Chafee Educational Vouchers program provides Title IV-E eligible foster youth up to \$5,000 per year for post-secondary education and training. Youth who received or were eligible to receive Independent Living Program (ILP) services between the ages of 16-19, and who do not reach their 22nd birthday by July 1 are eligible. Youth can continue to participate until they turn 23 years of age, if making satisfactory progress toward completion of a post-secondary education or training program.⁶

Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP)

THPP is a licensed placement opportunity for youth in foster care to help them emancipate successfully. THPP agency staff, county social workers, and ILP coordinators provide regular support and supervision. Support services include regular visits to participants' residences, educational guidance, employment counseling and assistance in reaching the emancipation goals outlined in participants' transitional independent living plans.

Transitional Housing Placement Program for Emancipated Foster/Probation Youth (THP-Plus)

THP-Plus eligible youth are young adults who have emancipated from foster/probation care and are 18 to 24 years of age. THP-Plus provides a minimum of 24 months of affordable housing, coupled with supportive services.

Resource Family Approval (RFA) Program

The RFA program requires CDSS, in consultation with county child welfare agencies, including Juvenile Probation, foster parent associations and other interested community parties to implement a unified, family friendly and child-centered RFA process.⁷

⁵ <http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/individuals/Pages/youthSUDservices.aspx>. This data is the most recent available here.

⁶ <http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG4861.htm>

⁷ http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/res/RFA/pdf/RFA_Overview.pdf

Employment Development Department (EDD)

Youth Employment Opportunity Program (YEOP)

This program provides services (e.g. peer advising, referrals to supportive services, workshops, job referrals and placement assistance, referrals to training, and community outreach efforts.⁸) to assist youth in achieving their educational and vocational goals.

America's Job Center of CaliforniaSM (AJCC)

The AJCC network links all state and local workforce services and resources across the state and country. The AJCC partners in California are the EDD, the California Workforce Development Board, and 49 Workforce Development Boards that administer the more than 200 job centers statewide.

2. Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs

Local data on juvenile crime in California are reported by the California Department of Justice (CalDOJ) Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC) in its annual publication Juvenile Justice in California. Juvenile arrest data are collected from law enforcement through the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). Additional juvenile justice data are collected from county probation departments through the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS).

A. Youth Crime Analysis

California's youth crime analysis, presented in Appendix N, shows that youth crime continues to exist but has been declining in recent years. Further analysis shows a number of areas where improvements could be made including diversions and alternatives to incarceration, as well as continuing efforts around reducing racial and ethnic disparities. The qualitative data gathered point toward multiple options for addressing this crime and assisting youth in achieving positive outcomes.

B. California's Priority Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements

The BSCC works in partnership with local corrections systems and assists efforts to achieve continued improvement in reducing recidivism with an emphasis on evidence-based practices (EBPs).

8 http://www.edd.ca.gov/jobs_and_training/Youth_Employment_Opportunity_Program.htm

California counties have the responsibility to provide services to youth. The BSCC assists counties by providing federal and state grant awards that help support their youth services. The BSCC's grant awards typically require counties and community partners to develop a local strategic plan that involves local stakeholders, leaders from multiple disciplines, and prior offenders to determine the gaps in the continuum of care for their youthful offenders. These plans may include leveraging resources to support collaboration and to sustain local projects once grant funds have ended.

State Plan

The BSCC annually reviews its crime data analysis, needs, and program effectiveness and reports these in the annual GMS and DC-TAT progress report systems. The SACJJDP uses this information, along with other sources, to develop a Title II Three-Year State Plan that allows for the coordination of existing juvenile delinquency programs, programs operated by public and private agencies and organizations, and other related programs (such as education, special education, recreation, health, and welfare programs) in California. Both the SACJJDP and the BSCC Board are made up of a variety of state and local criminal/juvenile justice system stakeholders, community treatment providers, advocates and members of the public, which provide for active consultation with and participation of units of local government and the community in the development of the state plan. The SACJJDP began work on its 2021-23 State Plan in June 2020. The SACJJDP hosted a public listening session on November 12, 2020 to hear directly from the community about issues, concerns and priorities for juvenile justice. A SACJJDP e-mail box was established and public input was accepted from interested parties beginning in November 2020. **Add description of Public Comment Services Contract and Survey.** As a result of these efforts, the SACJJDP had the benefit of numerous data and information sources in making the important decision about how to prioritize the use of Title II funds over the next three years. All of these information sources, combined with the unique lived experiences of the SACJJDP members, pointed toward nine high priority needs within California's juvenile justice system.

Recommendation 1: Utilize the SACJJDP as a true State Advisory Group on critical issues related to juvenile justice including the implementation of Senate Bill 823.

The SACJJDP is a federally mandated State Advisory Group with each member appointed by the Governor. One of our primary functions is to advise the Governor on critical issues related to juvenile justice in the State of California including but not limited to alternatives to detention, reentry, evidence-based programming, conditions of confinement, racial/ethnic disparities, tribal and native youth issues, addressing trauma among justice-involved youth, community-based programming, and delinquency prevention.

The Committee is specifically eager to support the Governor in the implementation of Senate Bill 823 with the overarching goals of creating the Office of Youth and Community Restoration in the California Health and Human Services Agency, realigning the Department of Juvenile Justice, and coordination and administration of juvenile justice grants.

Recommendation 2: Ensure that Federal and State funds are routed directly to support the community.

A significant amount of research and lived experience has confirmed that community-based programming and resources are more effective in reducing recidivism, improving public safety, promoting youth wellbeing, and saving tax dollars. In order to ensure that funding for such programming makes it into the community, local jurisdictions (e.g., Probation Departments, Law Enforcement Agencies, etc.) must be held accountable when receiving funds that are intended for youth-focused community-based programming. For example, state and federal dollars through the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) provided \$321 million to counties in Fiscal Year 2018-19ⁱ. However, these funds are often spent on supplemental funds to staff probation departments or, even more concerning, are left unspent rather than being spent on community-based programs for which they were intendedⁱⁱ. In addition, legislation that earmarks taxpayer dollars for youth-focused programming should not require a pass through with a City or County agency.

Recommendation 3: Decisions about practice and policy must be data driven.

The collection of actionable data at the County level is essential to reducing racial/ethnic disparities, identifying best practices, and developing evidence-principled policies. This first step in reducing racial/ethnic disparities is identifying the point(s) of contact in the system that contribute to the disparities at the County level which is required per the JJDPAⁱⁱⁱ. Because juvenile justice data is decentralized in the State of California there is no uniform data collection occurring across counties and access to data are extremely limited. This makes data driven decision-making through research and evaluation extremely difficult, if not impossible in some areas. Per Senate Bill 823, a workgroup must be convened to develop a plan for ‘a modern database and reporting system’^{iv}. This provides an opportunity to begin to address the lack of juvenile justice data across the state.

Recommendation 4: Implement a State level mandate to systematically reduce racial and ethnic disparities at all points of contact in the juvenile justice system.

Based on data analysis at the County level, actionable steps must be taken and accountability measures implemented to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in measurable ways at all points of contact in the juvenile justice system. Reputable organizations have been successfully addressing racial and ethnic disparities for many years, such as the Haywood Burns Institute, the Annie E. Casey’s Juvenile Detention Alternatives Program, and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. Agencies of government including local law enforcement (police, sheriffs, CHP), justice system (DA, public defenders, judges, etc.), probation, health and human services, and others should be partnering with such subject matter expert organizations through technical assistance contracts in order to provide evidence of the reduction of racial and ethnic disparities.

Recommendation 5: Encourage and support in every way the use of community-based diversion as the primary approach to justice system involvement; detention should be a last resort.

As soon as a young person has contact with the juvenile justice system the goal should be figuring out how to successfully get them out of the system. Prioritizing diversion has been shown to positively impact youth of color given their increased likelihood of juvenile justice contact and disproportionate risk for more severe sanctions. If a youth can't be diverted away from the system initially, the system must continue to work to successfully transition each

youth out of the system no matter where they are in the system. The best way to do that is with community-based organizations not through informal or formal probation. Community-based organizations are more likely to hire those with lived experience, who can address the root causes of trauma and focus on healing and mentoring in order for youth to thrive.

Recommendation 6: Counties must have an effective and comprehensive plan for initial and ongoing training for those who work with youth involved in the juvenile justice system.

It is essential that those who work with youth involved in the juvenile justice system are trained on issues related to racial/ethnic disparities, implicit bias, child and adolescent development, trauma-informed care, how to be anti-racist, evidence-based practices, principles and programs in juvenile justice, mental health, and positive youth development. Training must be interdisciplinary, ongoing, and skills based. Trainers should include individuals in the community who work directly with youth and/or individuals who have lived experience in the system themselves to ensure cultural appropriateness and community relevance. Technical assistance must be provided following trainings to ensure that skills learned in the trainings are applied, practiced, and become routine in daily practices.

Recommendation 7: Hire individuals that understand the vast potential youth possess and their role in helping youth succeed.

The Supreme Court has recognized that “children are different” and should be treated as such. This means that those who are hired to work with youth involved in the juvenile justice system must understand the developmental differences between adolescents and adults, take a non-punitive approach to youth justice, and recognize that working with youth and families in the communities in which they live and should draw on the principles of social work, adolescent development, public health, and racial equity. Adolescence is an age of opportunity, during which youth are highly sensitive to and influenced by their environments and their relationships such that when they are surrounded by positive people and experiences, they are most likely to succeed. Conversely, incarceration, punishment, and discrimination have the opposite effect by increasing the risk for adult criminal justice involvement, reducing educational attainment, and increasing racial and ethnic disparities.

Recommendation 8: Reduce the use of detention.

Youth of color bear the brunt of punitive detention practices which means many youth are detained for reasons that are not related to public safety such as certain violations of probation, status offenses, bench warrants for missing a court date, or pre-trial detention for youth who have not been charged with a violent or serious crime. In fact, pre-trial detention makes up 75% of local juvenile detention admissions across the nation^v and in California about one-third of youth petitioned to juvenile court experience pre-trial detention^{vi}. The use of detention, and its disproportionate impact on youth of color, can be dramatically reduced in very simple ways. For instance, notifying a family when a youth's court date is coming up, not detaining youth for truancy in alignment with the JJDP, or only detaining a youth on a probation violation when it includes a new crime.

Recommendation 9: Detained and incarcerated youth and those being released to the community must have immediate access to a continuum of resources to meet their complex reentry needs.

In the rare occurrences that youth need to be detained or incarcerated (i.e., for violent crimes or if they are an immediate threat to public safety), they must have access to programming. This should include, at minimum, education services, mental health services, life skills, job training, health care services, religious and cultural services, and access to services provided by culturally competent community-based organizations. As soon as youth are removed from the community, planning must begin for their return to the community so that there is a smooth transition and warm handoff between the facility and the community. Community-based organizations should be involved in the reentry process prior to the youth being released from detention to ensure a continuum of care is provided. Community-based organizations support young people and families in neighborhoods that are unique environments. Their inclusion in the reentry process is vital to ensuring the best possible outcomes for youth.

1. Formula Grant Program

The Formula Grant Program Areas identified by the SACJJDP for inclusion in any requests for local assistance grant proposals to be developed under the 2021-23 State Plan are:

- Aftercare/Reentry
- Alternatives to Detention and Placement

- Community-Based Programs and Services
- Diversion
- Mental Health Services
- Mentoring, Counseling, and Training Programs

Local Assistance Grant Administration

Many of the decisions made by the BSCC directly impact the day-to-day operations of local public safety agencies and service providers. To ensure successful program design and implementation, it is essential that those impacted are included in the decision making process. The BSCC uses Executive Steering Committees (ESCs) to inform decision making related to the Board's programs, including distributing funds and developing regulations. ESCs help the BSCC to work collaboratively in changing environments and create positive partnerships critical for success. Active consultation with, and participation by, units of local government is provided through the appointment of local government representatives on ESCs. Moreover, the BSCC Board and the SACJDP have multiple members who represent units of local government. Consequently, local government participation in the discussion and decision making processes related to juvenile justice in California is ensured on many levels.

This collaborative approach is supported by the BSCC's statute, Penal Code section 6024 (c), which states:

The Board shall regularly seek advice from a balanced range of stakeholders and subject matter experts on issues pertaining to adult corrections, juvenile justice, and gang problems relevant to its mission. Toward this end, the Board shall seek to ensure that its efforts

1. are systematically informed by experts and stakeholders with the most specific knowledge concerning the subject matter,
2. include the participation of those who must implement a board decision and are impacted by a board decision, and
3. promote collaboration and innovative problem solving consistent with the mission of the Board.

The Board may create special committees, with the authority to establish working subgroups as necessary, in furtherance of this subdivision to carry out specified tasks and to submit its findings and recommendations from that effort to the board.

In order to provide for an equitable distribution of the assistance received under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] within the state, ESCs may develop strategies to ensure rural areas have equitable access to funding opportunities. For example, an ESC may establish funding thresholds for small, medium, and large jurisdictions. Following a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process, ESC members (raters) are provided training and then rank proposals received in each jurisdiction size. Not later than 30 days after their submission to the SACJJDP for review, the SACJJDP is provided the opportunity to review the proposals and ESC proposal ratings and to develop an award recommendation to the Board.

[Subgrants Awarded under the 2018-2020 Three-Year Plan](#)

The SACJJDP previously recommended, and the BSCC approved, the allocation of over \$4,000,000 per year for three years (12/1/19-11/30/22)] for local subgrantee awards to provide funding for the following federal program areas:

- Aftercare/Reentry
- Alternatives to Detention
- Community-Based Programs & Services
- Diversion
- Mental Health Services
- Mentoring, Counseling, & Training Programs

The 2019 Title II Grant Program Request for Proposals (RFP), as developed by the Title II Grant Program ESC with guidance and leadership from the SACJJDP included language that directed applicants to incorporate evidenced-based practices, principles, and strategies, consider racial and ethnic disparities in their system, and be prepared to delineate some outcome measures by age, gender, and race/ethnicity. Eligible applicants included California Counties, California Cities, California School Districts, Nonprofit Nongovernmental Organizations, and Federally recognized Indian Tribes in California.

Based on a competitive RFP process completed in the fall of 2019, Title II Formula Grant funds continue to support 12 local entities: eight (8) community-based organizations; one (1) community-based organization in partnership with a Native American Tribe; one (1) juvenile probation department; one (1) police department; and one (1) County office of education. These Title II subgrantees are in year two in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020.

2. Collecting and Sharing Juvenile Justice Information

3.1: Title II Grant Program: Identifying Effective Interventions and Replicable Strategies for Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities.

The SACJJDP solicited a contractor by releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) on November 20, 2020. The SACJJDP is seeking a contractor with Racial and Ethnic Disparity project experience to develop a State and County data dashboard, to conduct a review of a sample of factors that contribute to Racial and Ethnic Disparity, and to develop a replicable framework for determining the appropriate measurable intervention. The final product will assist the SACJJDP in making data-driven recommendations on the allocation of Title II funding directed towards reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity in the Juvenile Justice system.

3.2: Efforts by the designated state agency to partner with non-justice system agencies

In addition to the ESC process already described, the BSCC routinely provides technical assistance and subject matter expertise to a wide array of stakeholders and its non-justice system agencies to aid California's legislative process. Attachment 1 lists new laws from 2019 that pertain to juvenile justice reform and are summarized as relevant to this State Plan:

3.3: Challenges and plans to improve coordination and joint decision-making

California is a large and diverse state with 58 different counties that maintain high levels of autonomy. Consequently, coordination and standardization of efforts is challenging. We will continue to prioritize coordination and joint decision making amongst stakeholders and partners.

Arrest data is collected by CalDOJ and distributed upon request to the BSCC and annually to Chief Probation Officers. CalDOJ's Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) collects a variety of juvenile statistical data, including information regarding R.E.D. from county probation departments on a yearly basis.

3.4: Youth crime data collection and analysis

California is a large, diverse state whose 58 counties address juvenile justice and delinquency prevention in ways tailored to their individual and unique local environments. This provides for maximum effectiveness of interventions but does create challenges in collecting and analyzing related data. Addressing Youth crime remains a high priority in

California and California and it continues to work towards improved coordinate, maintain quality of youth crime data collection and analysis.

The following agencies have a role in youth crime data collection and analysis:

CalDOJ

The CalDOJ collects statewide information through a variety of sources, makes data available on its website, and annually publishes data in its “Crime in California” and “Juvenile Justice in California” reports.¹⁰

Local data on juvenile crime in California continues to be reported by the CalDOJ Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC) in its annual publication Juvenile Justice in California. Juvenile arrest data is collected from law enforcement through the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). Additional juvenile justice data is collected from county probation departments through the JCPSS.

The BSCC

There are several ways that the BSCC is involved in juvenile justice data collection as follows:

State law requires that counties annually submit to the BSCC data about programs, placements, services and system enhancements that were funded through specified state funds in the preceding fiscal year. These reports also include countywide figures for specified juvenile justice data elements available in existing statewide juvenile justice data systems, including a summary or analysis of how those programs have or may have contributed to or influenced the countywide data that is reported. Counties report data on their entire juvenile justice population and provide information on how the use of the specified funds has impacted the trends seen in that data.

The BSCC typically requires Local Evaluation Reports of its competitive grant funded programs that include performance and outcome data.

The BSCC routinely requires competitive grant funded programs to provide progress reports that provide demographic, service provision/system improvement, and outcome data.

¹⁰ <https://oag.ca.gov/cjsc/pubs#crimeCAUS>

Problem Statements, Goals/Objectives, & Implementation and Budget Narrative

4.1: Program Descriptions

- During development of the 2021-23 California State Plan, the BSCC had numerous active subgrants. The final subgrantee awards reviewed and approved by the SACJJDP and the
1. BSCC. Program updates are shared with the SACJJDP upon request and outcomes will be reported at the conclusion of each grant cycle. All mandatory performance measures required by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) are included in the quarterly Title II progress reports that are provided to the BSCC directly from the project grantees. Across all grant programs, and within the various formula grant program areas, R.E.D. is a priority and to the degree possible is embedded in the planning and work of the BSCC.

4.2: Formula Grants Priority Purpose Areas

TBD

ⁱWashburn, M. & Menart, R. (2020). A Blueprint for Reform: Moving Beyond California's Failed Youth Correctional System. Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. Retrieved from: http://www.cjci.org/uploads/cjci/documents/blueprint_for_reform.pdf

ⁱⁱ Same as above

ⁱⁱⁱ H.R.6964 - Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018.

^{iv} SB-823 Juvenile justice realignment: Office of Youth and Community Restoration.

^v Walker, S. C., & Herting, J. R. (2020). The Impact of Pretrial Juvenile Detention on 12-Month Recidivism: A Matched Comparison Study. Crime and Delinquency. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720926115>

^{vi} Becerra, X. (2018). Juvenile Justice in California. CA Department of Justice. Retrieved from: <https://data-openjustice.doj.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-07/Juvenile%20Justice%20In%20CA%202018%2020190701.pdf>